

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-32 are pending, with claims 1, 20, and 32 being independent. Claim 17 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 8, 20, 23, and 32 have been amended. Support for these changes can be found in the specification, for example, at page 25, lines 1-28. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 1, 8, 20, 23, and 32 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of the invention. Claim 17 has been cancelled. For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 1-32.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 8-20, and 23-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Hirota (6,606,707).

As amended, claim 1 recites, among other features, "configuring the media player to access a permissions engine that interfaces with a multitiered rule base that is configured to store a medium rule base, a media player rule base, and a host rule base, wherein the medium rule base is based on content permissions associated with the medium, the media player rule base is based on content permissions associated with the media player, and the host rule base is based on content permissions associated with the host." In addition, claim 1 recites "checking availability of the host rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the host rule base is available, accessing the host rule base," "checking availability of the media player rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the media player rule base is available, accessing the media player rule base," and "checking availability of the medium rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the medium rule base is available, accessing the medium rule base." Furthermore, claim 1 recites "identifying priorities for rule bases within the multitiered rule base based on availability of the

medium rule base, the media player rule base, and the host rule base within the multitiered rule base” and “using the profile to analyze a content request with a the multitiered rule base based on the identified priorities of rule bases within the multitiered rule base.”

Hirota does not teach or suggest the above features. In particular, Hirota is directed to a system that is capable of playback of encoded content stored on a media card *either* from a PC or from a media player. See e.g., Hirota, Col. 15:5-6, Col. 16:1-2, and etc. Thus, the system of Hirota would look to either PC or the media player during authentication of the content on the media card, but would not look to the PC and the media player at the same time. As such, the system in Hirota would not perform the steps of checking availability of all three of a medium rule base, a media player rule base, and a host rule base. Therefore, Hirota does not teach “checking availability of the host rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the host rule base is available, accessing the host rule base,” “checking availability of the media player rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the media player rule base is available, accessing the media player rule base,” and “checking availability of the medium rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the medium rule base is available, accessing the medium rule base,” as recited by claim 1.

Moreover, because Hirota fails to teach or suggest the above limitations, Hirota also lacks in disclosure of “identifying priorities for rule bases within the multitiered rule base based on availability of the medium rule base, the media player rule base, and the host rule base within the multitiered rule base,” as is also recited in claim 1. Hirota is simply silent with respect to this limitation because it does not rely on identification for rule bases during decrypting of content stored on the media card.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of amended independent claim 1 and its respective dependent claims.

Similarly, independent claims 20 and 32 recite an arrangement for regulating access to a content selection that is similar to that recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claim 20 and 32 and their respective dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to amended independent claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 6-7, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirota (6,606,707) in view of Ginter (5,892,900).

For the same reasons as were recited above for claims 1, 20, and 32, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Ginter does not help to remedy the failure of Hirota to describe or suggest features discussed with respect to independent claims 1, 20, and 32 above. Notably, the Office Action does not rely on Ginter to show features, such as "checking availability of the host rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the host rule base is available, accessing the host rule base," "checking availability of the media player rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the media player rule base is available, accessing the media player rule base," "checking availability of the medium rule base in the multitiered rule base and, if the medium rule base is available, accessing the medium rule base," and "identifying priorities for rule bases within the multitiered rule base based on availability of the medium rule base, the media player rule base, and the host rule base within the multitiered rule base."


For these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-7, 21, and 22.

The Petition for Extension of Time fee of \$120 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

2/17/2003



Thomas A. Rozylowicz
Reg. No. 50,620

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
40466634.doc